arXiv:0709.4084v1 [math.AC] 26 Sep 2007

UPPER BOUNDS OF HILBERT COEFFICIENTS AND HILBERT FUNCTIONS

JUAN ELIAS *

Abstract. Let $(R, \mathbf{m})$ be a d-dimensional Cohen-Macaulay local ring. In this note we prove, in a very elementary way, an upper bound of the first normalized Hilbert coefficient of a $\mathbf{m}$-primary ideal $I \subset R$ that improves all known upper bounds unless for a finite number of cases, see Remark 1.3. We also provide new upper bounds of the Hilbert functions of I extending the known bounds for the maximal ideal.

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to provide new upper bounds for the first normalized Hilbert coefficient and the Hilbert function of a $\mathbf{m}-$primary ideal. In the first section we give an upper bound of the first normalized Hilbert coefficient $e_1(I)$ for an $\mathbf{m}$-primary ideal I taking account the multiplicity of I and the Hilbert polynomial of R, Proposition 1.1. This new bound improves the bound of [7] eventually unless a finite number of cases. For instance: if $I \subset \mathbf{m}^2$ then the bound of this paper is better than the bound of [7], see Remark 1.3. The advantage of the result proved here is that its proof is very elementary skipping the theory of Ratliff-Rush closure or the integral closure of ideals. For more details on the upper bounds of the first Hilbert coefficient see the beginning of section 1.

In the second section we give several upper bounds of the Hilbert function of I generalizing some results of [8]. The main ingredients of these bounds are the upper bound for the first normalized Hilbert coefficient and the upper bound of the postulation number, Proposition 2.1. This upper bound of the postulation is given in terms of the normalized Hilbert coefficients of I and the length of the conormal module I/I^2.

Notations. Let R be a d-dimensional Cohen-Macaulay ring with maximal ideal $\mathbf{m}$. Without loss of generality we can assume that the residue field $\mathbf{k} = R/\mathbf{m}$ is infinite. Let I be an $\mathbf{m}$-primary ideal of R, the Hilbert-Samuel function of I is defined by $H_I^0(n) = \mathrm{Length}_R(I^n/I^{n+1})$, $n \geq 0$. The i-th Hilbert-Samuel function of I, $i \geq 1$, is $H_I^i(n) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} H_I^{i-1}(j)$, $n \geq 0$. It is well known that there exist integers $e_j(I) \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$h_I^i(X) = \sum_{j=0}^{d+i-1} (-1)^j e_j(I) \binom{X+d+i-j-1}{d+i-j-1}$$

is the i-Hilbert-Samuel polynomial of I, i.e. $H_I^i(n) = h_I^i(n)$ for $n \gg 0$, $i \geq 0$. We denote by $pn(I)$ the postulation number of I, i.e. the least integer $pn(I)$ such that $H_I^0(n) = h_I^0(n)$

---

*Partially supported by DGICYT BFM2001-3584

2000 MSC: 13A30, 13C14, 13D40.

for all $n \geq pn(I)$; the stability $st(R)$ of R is the supreme of $pn(I)$ where I range over all the $\mathbf{m}-$primary ideals of R. The order or initial degree of I is the integer $o_{\mathbf{m}}(I)$ such that $I \subset \mathbf{m}^{o_{\max}(I)}$ and $I \nsubseteq \mathbf{m}^{o_{\max}(I)+1}$, i.e. the last integer n such that $H_I^0(n) = H_R^0(n)$. We denote by $b(I) = H_I^0(1) = \mathrm{Length}_R(I/I^2)$ the length of the conormal module of I. In the maximal ideal case we write $H_R^* = H_{\mathbf{m}}^*$, $b(R) = b(\mathbf{m})$ is the embedding dimension of R, and $e_i(R) = e_i(\mathbf{m})$, $i \geq 0$.

The i-Poincaré series of I is the generating function of H_I^i:

$$P_I^i = \sum_{n \geq 0} H_I^i(n)\ T^n \quad \in \mathbb{Z}[[T]]$$

$i \geq 0$. Since H_I^i is asymptotically polynomial there exists a degree $pn(I) + d - 1$ polynomial $f(T) \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ such that

$$P_I^i = \frac{f(T)}{(1-T)^{d+i}}$$

An ideal $J \subset R$ is a reduction of I if there exists an integer r such that $I^{r+1} = JI^r$. The reduction number of I is the least integer $r(I)$ for which there exists a reduction J of I such that $I^{r(I)+1} = JI^{r(I)}$. We denote by $\mu(I)$ the minimal number of generators of I.

The author acknowledges the useful comments of M.E. Rossi.

1. Upper bound of $e_1(I)$

In [1] we characterize the Hilbert-Samuel polynomials of one-dimensional Cohen-Macaulay local rings R, in particular we give a sharp upper bound of the first normalized Hilbert coefficient $e_1(R)$ in terms of the multiplicity of R and its embedding dimension $b(R)$, see also [2]. This upper bound was naturally generalized in [3] to $\mathbf{m}$-primary ideals I. In [7] Rossi and Valla improved the bound of [3] by considering the minimal number of generators of I and the length of R/I.

In this section we give an upper bound of the first normalized Hilbert coefficient of I in terms of the Hilbert-Samuel polynomial of R and the multiplicity of I improving the bound of Rossi and Valla. We include some known results of Northcott completing the picture on $e_1(I)$.

Proposition 1.1. *Let R be a d-dimensional Cohen-Macaulay ring. Let I be a $\mathbf{m}$-primary ideal of R, then*

(i) [Northcott] $0 \leq e_0(I) - \mathrm{Length}_R(R/I) \leq e_1(I)$,
(ii) $e_0(R)o_{\max}(I) \leq e_0(I)$,
(iii) *If $d = 1$ then* $e_1(I) \leq pn(I)(e_0(I) - e_0(R)o_{\max}(I)) + e_1(R)$.
For $d \geq 1$ it holds

$$e_1(I) \leq (e_0(R) - 1)(e_0(I) - e_0(R)o_{\max}(I)) + e_1(R).$$

Proof. (*i*) is due to Northcott, [5]. (*ii*) and (*iii*) for $d = 1$. Since the residue field is infinite we can assume that R is one-dimensional. Notice that from [4], Theorem 1.5, and the fact $I \subset \mathbf{m}^{o_{\max}(I)}$ we deduce

$$e_0(R)(n\, o_{\max}(I)) - e_1(R) \le \operatorname{Length}_R(R/\mathbf{m}^{n\, o_{\max}(I)}) \le$$
$$\le \operatorname{Length}_R(R/I^n) = e_0(I)n - e_1(I)$$

for all $n \ge pn(I)$. Hence we get $e_0(R)o_{\max}(I) \le e_0(I)$, and for $n = pn(I)$ we deduce

$$e_1(I) \le pn(I)(e_0(I) - e_0(R)o_{\max}(I)) + e_1(R).$$

(*iii*) for $d \ge 1$. Notice that, since the residue field is infinite, $e_1(I)$ and the integer

$$(e_0(R) - 1)(e_0(I) - e_0(R)o_{\max}(I)) + e_1(R)$$

is stable by quotienting R by a generic regular sequence. Hence we may assume that R is one-dimensional. Notice that $pn(I) \le e_0(R) - 1$, [9] Theorem 2.5, so from the inequality (*iii*) in the one-dimensional case we get

$$e_1(I) \le (e_0(R) - 1)(e_0(I) - e_0(R)o_{\max}(I)) + e_1(R).$$

□

Let R be a d-dimensional Cohen-Macaulay local ring and let I be an $\mathbf{m}$-primary ideal of R. We denote by $\epsilon(I)$ the upper bound of $e_1(I)$ of the last result:

$$\epsilon(I) = (e_0(R) - 1)(e_0(I) - e_0(R)o_{\max}(I)) + e_1(R).$$

Rossi and Valla gave the following upper bound of $e_1(I)$, [7],

$$e_1(I) \le \rho(I) = \binom{e_0(I)}{2} - \binom{\mu(I) - d}{2} - \operatorname{Length}_R(R/I) + 1.$$

In the next result we prove that the bound $\epsilon(I)$ improves $\rho(I)$ unless a finite number of cases.

Proposition 1.2. *Let R be a d-dimensional Cohen-Macaulay ring. Let I be a $\mathbf{m}$-primary ideal of R such that $e_0(I) \ge 2e_0(R) - 1$ then*

$$\epsilon(I) \le \rho(I).$$

If $b(R) \ge 3$ or $o_{\max}(I) \ge 3$ then the last inequality is strict.

Proof. Since the residue field is infinite we can consider that $d = 1$. A simple computation and by using the inequalities $\operatorname{Length}_R(R/I) \le e_0(I)$ and

$$e_1(R) \le \binom{e_0(R)}{2} - \binom{b-1}{2},$$

$b = b(R)$, [1], yields us

$$2(\rho(I) - \epsilon(I)) \ge$$
$$\ge e_0(I)(e_0(I) - 2\, e_0(R) - 1) + 2\, e_0(R)(e_0(R)(o_{\max}(I) - 1) - o_{\max}(I) + 2) + 2\binom{b-1}{2}.$$

Let us assume $o_{\max}(I)=1$. Then we have

$$2(\rho(I)-\epsilon(I)) \geq e_0(I)(e_0(I)-2\,e_0(R)-1)+2\,e_0(R)+2\binom{b-1}{2}.$$

If $e_0(I)\geq 2\,e_0(R)-1$ then we deduce

$$2(\rho(I)-\epsilon(I)) \geq\ e_0(R)(-2)+2\,e_0(R)+2\binom{b-1}{2}=2\binom{b-1}{2}\geq 0.$$

If $b(R)\geq 3$ then $2(\rho(I)-\epsilon(I))>0$.
Let us assume that $o_{\max}(I)\geq 2$. Since $e_0(I)\geq o_{\max}(I)\,e_0(R)$ we have

$$2(\rho(I)-\epsilon(I)) \geq e_0(R)((o_{\max}(I)^2-2)e_0(R)-3\,o_{\max}(I)+4)+2\binom{b-1}{2}.$$

Notice that $o_{\max}(I)^2-2\geq 0$ and $e_0(R)\geq 1$, so

$$2(\rho(I)-\epsilon(I)) \geq o_{\max}(I)^2-3\,o_{\max}(I)+2+2\binom{b-1}{2}\geq 0.$$

If $b(R)\geq 3$ or $o_{\max}(I)\geq 3$ then $2(\rho(I)-\epsilon(I))>0$. □

Remark 1.3. Notice that the non covered cases by the last proposition are finite: $o_{\max}(I)=1$ and $e_0(R)\leq e_0(I)\leq 2e_0(R)-2$. In particular if $I\subset \mathbf{m}^2$ then $\epsilon(I)\leq\rho(I)$.

Remark 1.4. Comparison with other upper bounds. Let us assume that R is one dimensional. In the proof of Theorem 3.1 of [8] it is proved that

$$e_1(I)\leq \alpha(I)=e_0(I)-\operatorname{Length}_R(R/I)+pn(I)(e_0(I)-2)-\binom{pn(I)+1}{2}$$

provided that $e_0(I)\neq e_0(R)$. It is easy to see that this bound is not comparable with the bound of Proposition 1.1 (*iii*)

$$\beta(I)=pn(I)(e_0(I)-e_0(R)o_{\max}(I))+e_1(R),$$

i.e. there exists ideals I such that $e_1(I)\leq\alpha(I)<\beta(I)$, resp. $e_1(I)\leq\beta(I)<\alpha(I)$.

Since $pn(I)$ behaves bad under quotienting then by considering the inequality $pn(I)\leq e_o(I)-1$ and the upper bound $\alpha(I)$, both in the one-dimensional case, Rossi and Valla prove for any d-dimensional local ring R, $d\geq 1$, that

$$e_1(I)\leq\binom{e_0(I)-2}{2}$$

provided $e_0(I)\neq e_0(R)$, [8] Proposition 3.1. An easy computation shows that our bound is better:

$$\epsilon(I)\leq\binom{e_0(I)-2}{2}$$

except a finite number of cases: $o_{\max}(I)=1$, $e_0(I)=e_0(R)+1$, and $e_0(R)\leq 2$ if $b(R)=e_0(R)+1$, or $e_0(R)\leq 4$ if $b(R)=e_0(R)$.

Recall that in [3], Proposition 2.5, we prove that $\epsilon(I)\leq\binom{e_0(I)-s(I)}{2}$ if $e_0(I)$ is a prime number.

2. Upper bounds of the Hilbert function

In this section we prove several upper bounds of the Hilbert function of $\mathbf{m}$-primary ideals generalizing and improving the upper bounds of the Hilbert function of R given in [8], Theorem 3.4. The main ingredients of the new bounds are the upper bound of the first normalized Hilbert coefficient and a new upper bound of the postulation number, Proposition 2.1.

Let R be a one-dimensional Cohen-Macaulay local ring and let I be an $\mathbf{m}-$primary ideal. For all $n \geq 0$ we set $v_n = e_0(I) - H_I^0(n)$. The set of integers $\{v_.\}$ satisfies the following conditions:

(1) $v_n \geq 0$, for all $n \geq 0$,
(2) $v_n = 0$ if and only if $n \geq pn(I)$,
(3) $e_1(I) = \sum_{n\geq 0} v_n$.

It is easy to prove from the definition of the integers $\{v_.\}$ that, $n \geq 0$,

$$H_I^1(n) = (n+1)e_0 - \sum_{j=0}^{n} v_j.$$

We define the integer $\lambda(I) = \operatorname{Length}_R(R/I)$. From the definition of v_0 and v_1 it is easy to see that $v_0 + v_1 = 2\, e_0(I) - \lambda(I) - b(I)$. Since $H_I^0(n) \leq e_0(I)$ we can consider the integer

$$\beta(I) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } e_0(I) = \lambda(I), \\ 1 & \text{if } e_0(I) = b(I), \\ e_1(I) - 2e_0(I) + \lambda(I) + b(I) + 2 & \text{if } e_0(I) > b(I). \end{cases}$$

In the next result we first recall, without proof and for the readers convenience, a known result on the stability due to Sally and Vasconcelos, see [9], Theorem 2.5. In the second part of the next result we prove that $\beta(I)$ is also an upper bound of the postulation number of I.

Proposition 2.1. *Let R be a one-dimensional Cohen-Macaulay ring and $I \subset R$ an $\mathbf{m}-$primary ideal. Then*

(i) [Sally-Vasconcelos] $n(I) = pn(I) \leq st(R) \leq e_0(R) - 1$,
(ii) $pn(I) \leq \beta(I)$.

Proof. (*ii*) Let us recall that if $H_I^0(n) = e_0(I)$ then $H_I^0(n+t) = e_0(I)$ for all $t \geq 0$, [4], Lemma 1.8. From this result we get the that $pn(I) \leq \beta(I)$ in the cases $e_0(I) = \lambda(I)$ and $e_0(I) = b(I)$.

Let us assume $e_0(I) > b(I)$, notice that we can write

$$e_1(I) = \sum_{n\geq 0} v_n = v_0 + v_1 + \sum_{n\geq 2} v_n = 2\, e_0(I) - \lambda(I) - b(I) + \sum_{n\geq 2} v_n,$$

so we get

$$\sum_{n\geq 2} v_n = e_1(I) - 2\, e_0(I) + \lambda(I) + b(I) = \beta(I) - 2.$$

From this inequality we deduce that $v_j = 0$ for all $j \geq \beta(I)$, in particular we get $pn(I) \leq \beta(I)$. ☐

Remark 2.2. Rossi in [6], Theorem 1.3, gives an upper bound of the postulation number of an $\mathbf{m}$-primary ideal by a subtle application of the determinantal trick:

$$pn(I) \leq w(I) = e_1(I) - e_0(I) + \lambda(I) + 1,$$

where I is an $\mathbf{m}-$primary ideal of a $d-$dimensional Cohen-Macaulay local ring R with $d = 1, 2$. Let us remark that the result of Rossi has its deep meaning in the two dimensional case. Our bound, whose proof follows the steps of [6], improves Rossi's bound, i.e. $\beta(I) \leq w(I)$, for all $\mathbf{m}$-primary ideal I of a one-dimensional Cohen-Macaulay local ring R.

In the next results we give upper bounds of the Hilbert function of $\mathbf{m}$-primary ideals, these results generalize [8], Theorem 3.4.

Theorem 2.3. *Let R be a one-dimensional Cohen-Macaulay local ring. Let I be an $\mathbf{m}-$primary ideal, then*

$$P_I^1 = \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda(I)}{(1-T)^2} & \text{if } \beta(I) = 0 \\ \\ \frac{\lambda(I)+(b(I)-\lambda(I))T}{(1-T)^2} & \text{if } \beta(I) = 1 \end{cases}$$

If $\beta(I) \geq 2$ then

$$P_I^1 \leq \frac{\lambda(I) + (b(I) - \lambda(I))T + (e_0(I) - b(I) - 1)T^2 + T^{\beta(I)}}{(1-T)^2}$$

Proof. We write $e_i = e_i(I)$, $\lambda = \lambda(I)$, $\alpha = \alpha(I)$ and $\beta = \beta(I)$.

If $\beta = 0$ then $H_I^0(n) = e_0$ for all $n \geq 0$, in this case we have $P_I^1 = \lambda/(1-T)^2$. If $\beta = 1$ then $H_I^0(0) = \lambda$ and $H_I^0(n) = e_0$ for all $n \geq 0$, so $P_I^1 = \lambda + (b - \lambda)T/(1-T)^2$. We can assume that $\beta \geq 2$. First we compute the right hand side power series of the inequality:

$$\frac{\lambda + (b-\lambda)T + (e_0 - b - 1)T^2 + T^\beta}{(1-T)^2} =$$

$$= \lambda + \sum_{j=2}^{\beta-1} ((j-1)(e_0 - 1) + b + \lambda)T^j + \sum_{\beta}^{\infty} (e_0(j+1) - e_1)T^j.$$

Since $H_I^1(0) = \lambda$ and $H_I^1(n) = e_0(n+1) - e_1$ for all $n \geq \beta$, Proposition 2.1, we have to prove

$$H_I^1(n) \leq (n-1)(e_0 - 1) + b + \lambda$$

for $n = 2, \cdots, \beta - 1$. Notice that this inequality is equivalent to

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n} v_j \geq 2e_0 - b - \lambda + n - 1. \tag{*}$$

If $v_n = 0$ then $\sum_{j=0}^{n} v_j = e_1$ and we have to prove $e_1 \geq 2e_0 - b - \lambda + n - 1$, this inequality is equivalent to the assumption $n \leq \beta - 1$.

If $v_n \neq 0$ then we may consider

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n} v_j - n = 2e_0 - \lambda - b + \sum_{j=2}^{n} v_j - n \geq 2e_0 - \lambda - b - 1$$

and we get (*). □

We can provide the result for a d-dimensional local ring. For this end we have to control the behavior of $b(I)$ by quotienting by a superficial sequence. Let $x_1, \cdots, x_{d-1} \in I$ be a superficial sequence of I. If we denote by $K = I/(x_1, \cdots, x_{d-1})$ and $R^* = R/(x_1, \cdots, x_{d-1})$ we have $\lambda(I) = \lambda(K)$, $e_i(K) = e_i(I)$, $i = 0, 1$, and

$$b(K) = b(I) - (d-1)\lambda(I) + \mathrm{Length}_R(I^2 \cap (x_1, \cdots, x_{d-1})/(x_1, \cdots, x_{d-1})I).$$

Theorem 2.4. *Let R be a d-dimensional Cohen-Macaulay local ring. Let I be an $\mathbf{m}-$primary ideal, and let $x_1, \cdots, x_{d-1} \in I$ be a superficial sequence of I. If we denote by $K = I/(x_1, \cdots, x_{d-1})$ then*

$$P_I^1 \leq \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda(K)}{(1-T)^2} & \text{if } \beta(K) = 0 \\ \\ \frac{\lambda(K)+(b(K)-\lambda(K))T}{(1-T)^2} & \text{if } \beta(K) = 1 \\ \\ \frac{\lambda(K)+(b(K)-\lambda(K))T+(e_0(I)-b(K)-1)T^2+T^{\beta(K)}}{(1-T)^2} & \text{if } \beta(K) \geq 2 \end{cases}$$

If the equality holds then $depth(gr_I(R)) \geq d-1$.

Proof. From Singh's inequality, [10], we get

$$P_I \leq \frac{P_K}{(1-T)^{d-1}},$$

from Proposition 2.3 we get the inequality of the claim. If we have $P_I = P_K/(1-T)^{d-1}$, then $depth(gr_I(R)) \geq d-1$, [10] □

We can skip the ideal K of the last proposition by considering a new invariant attached to I instead $\beta(I)$. Following [8] we can generalize to the $\mathbf{m}$-primary case some results of that paper.

Let us recall that Rossi and Valla prove that

$$e_1(I) \leq \rho(I) = \binom{e_0(I)}{2} - \binom{\mu(I)-1}{2} - \mathrm{Length}_R(R/I) + 1$$

According to this bound we define $\alpha(I)$ as the last integer n such that

$$\binom{n}{2} \leq \binom{e_0(I)}{2} - e_1(I) - \mathrm{Length}_R(R/I) + 1,$$

notice that $\alpha(I) \geq \mu(I) - 1$. We define the integer

$$\delta(I) = e_1(I) - 2e_0(I) + (\alpha(I)+2)\,\lambda(I).$$

Lemma 2.5. *For all* $\mathbf{m}$*-primary ideal we have*

$$\beta(I) \leq \delta(I) + 2.$$

Proof. We have to prove that

$$e_1(I) - 2e_0(I) + \lambda(I) + b(I) + 2 = \beta(I) \leq \delta(I) + 2 = e_1(I) - 2e_0(I) + (\alpha(I) + 2)\, \lambda(I) + 2,$$

this inequality is equivalent to $b(I) \leq (\alpha(I) + 1)\, \lambda(I)$. This inequality follows from the natural epimorphism of R/I-modules $(R/I)^{\mu(I)} \to I/I^2$ and the fact $\alpha(I) \geq \mu(I) - 1$. ☐

The following result is a generalization to $\mathbf{m}$-primary ideals of [8], Theorem 3.4. In the one dimensional case the upper bound of Proposition 2.3 is termwise smaller that the upper bound in (i) of the next result.

Proposition 2.6. *Let* R *be a Cohen-Macaulay local ring of dimension* d*. Let* I *be an* $\mathbf{m}-$*primary ideal.*

(i) *If* $d = 1$ *then it holds*

$$P_I^1 \leq \frac{\lambda(I) + \alpha(I)\lambda(I)T + (e_0(I) - (\alpha(I) + 1)\lambda(I) - 1)T^2 + T^{\delta(I)+2}}{(1 - T)^2}$$

(ii) *If* $d \geq 2$ *then it holds*

$$P_I \leq \frac{\lambda(I) + \alpha(I)\lambda(I)T + (e_0 - (\alpha(I) + 1)\lambda(I) - 1)T^2 + T^{\delta(I)+2}}{(1 - T)^d}.$$

If the equality holds then depth$(gr_I(R)) \geq d - 1$*.*

Proof. We write $e_i = e_i(I)$, $\lambda = \lambda(I)$, $\alpha = \alpha(I)$ and $\delta = \delta(I)$.
(i) First we compute the right hand side power series of the inequality (i)

$$\frac{\lambda + \alpha\lambda T + (e_0 - (\alpha + 1)\lambda - 1)T^2 + T^{\delta+2}}{(1 - T)^2} =$$

$$= \lambda + \sum_{j=2}^{\delta+1} ((j - 1)(e_0 - 1) + (\alpha + 2)\lambda)T^j + \sum_{\delta+2}^{\infty} (e_0(j + 1) - e_1)T^j.$$

From the proof of Proposition 2.3 (i) we only need to prove that:

(a) $(j - 1)(e_0 - 1) + (\alpha + 2)\lambda \geq (j - 1)(e_0 - 1) + b + \lambda$ for all $j = 1, \cdots, \beta - 1$, and

(b) $(j - 1)(e_0 - 1) + (\alpha + 2)\lambda \geq e_0(j + 1) - e_1$ for all $j = \beta, \cdots, \delta + 1$.

The inequality in (a) is equivalent to $(\alpha + 1)\lambda \geq b$, and this inequality follows natural epimorphism of R/I-modules $(R/I)^{\mu(I)} \to I/I^2$ and the fact $\alpha(I) \geq \mu(I) - 1$.
The inequality in (b) is equivalent to $\delta + 1 \geq j$.

(ii) Let $x_1, \cdots, x_{d-1} \in I$ be a superficial sequence of I. If we denote by $K = I/(x_1, \cdots, x_{d-1})$ and $R^* = R/(x_1, \cdots, x_{d-1})$ we have $\lambda = \text{Length}_R(R/I) = \text{Length}_R(R^*/K)$, $e_i(K) = e_i(I)$, $i = 0, 1$, and $\delta(K) = \delta$.

From Singh's inequality, [10], we get

$$P_I \leq \frac{P_K}{(1-T)^{d-1}},$$

from (i) we get the inequality in (ii). If we have $P_I = P_K/(1-T)^{d-1}$, then $depth(gr_I(R)) \geq d-1$, [10]. $\square$

References

[1] J. Elias, *Characterization of the Hilbert-Samuel polynomials of curve singularities*, Compositio Math. **74** (1990), 135–155.

[2] ———, *On the deep structure of the blowing-up of curve singularities*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **131** (2001), 227–240.

[3] ———, *On the first normalized Hilbert coefficient*, J. of Pure and Applied Algebra **201** (2005), 116–125.

[4] J. Lipman, *Stable ideals and Arf rings*, Amer. J. of Math. **93** (1971), 649–685.

[5] D.G. Northcott, *A note on the coefficients of the abstract Hilbert function*, J. London Math. Soc. **35** (1960), 209–214.

[6] M. E. Rossi, *A bound on the reduction number of a primary ideal*, Proc. A.M.S. **128** (2000), 1325–1332.

[7] M.E. Rossi and G. Valla, *The Hilbert function of the Ratliff-Rush filtration*, J. of Pure and Applied Algebra **201** (2005), 25–41.

[8] M.E. Rossi, G. Valla, and W.V. Vasconcelos, *Maximal Hilbert Functions*, Result. Math. **39** (2001), 99–114.

[9] J. Sally and W.V. Vasconcelos, *Stable rings*, J. Pure and Appl. Alg. **4** (1974), 319–336.

[10] B. Singh, *Effect of a permisible blowing-up on the local Hilbert function*, Inv. Math. **26** (1974), 201–212.

Departament d'Àlgebra i Geometria
Facultat de Matemàtiques
Universitat de Barcelona
Gran Via 585, 08007 Barcelona, Spain
E-mail address: `elias@ub.edu`